

TED KACZYNSKI

November 19, 1998

to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

PERSONAL to Mr. Friedlander.
to be read by him only.

Dear Beau,

Thanks for your letter of November 13. Let me say first the easy things I have to say to you and save the difficult part for last.

First of all, Michael Mello did not initiate the contacts between him and me; I did.

I know almost nothing about Alston Chase's book, so I can't tell you anything about it. But recently two of my correspondents have sent me information about Chase that forces me to doubt his honesty. Here's a sample from one of my correspondents:

"I've been doing a lot of research lately into Alston Chase, and everything I see points toward my original assessment, which is that he is nothing more than your garden variety corporate whore. ... He says crap like there is more old growth [forest] today than before Columbus arrived. He says logging isn't a threat to forests, and that it isn't natural or beneficial for trees to live for hundreds of years. In his book "In a Dark Wood," he blames the spotted owl for the loss of jobs in the Northwest. ... [H]e ignores the fact that overcapitalization of timber mills had guaranteed a timber supply squeeze which had been predicted for at least thirty years. He ignores raw log exports ... He ignores automation (all through the 70s and 80s, as the cut went up, job numbers went down). ... He says that spotted owls like second growth. ... [H]e defends DDT as safe. He defends plutonium as safe, in fact healthful.

He says, 'Civilizations, not nature, are fragile flowers, and when they disappear, they are gone forever. By contrast, the earth eventually recovers from abuse. He attacks environmentalists because they allegedly 'believe saving the environment is more important than liberty, justice or observing the law.' ... He states, 'Once we recognize that the balance of nature is not the supreme good, the house that biocentrism built collapses.'

Another of my correspondents sent me copies of book reviews and other documents that support this picture of Chase's opinions.

What bothers me is not the fact that Alston Chase holds opinions with which I vehemently disagree. I can communicate on amicable terms with an ideological opponent provided he is honest with me. But Chase's letters and the samples of his writing that he sent me gave me an ~~very different~~ impression of his attitudes very different than what I have recently received from other sources. In fact, what Chase sent me seems to have been selected to mislead me about his opinions. (I should explain that Chase initially contacted me with a request for information for his book.)

I've written to Chase inviting him to defend himself. Until I've received his answer, please keep confidential not ~~at~~ only what I've just told you, but even the fact that I've been corresponding with Chase.

My copy of the ms. of the Manifesto that was received by the New York Times is currently out on loan to someone else. I should get it back fairly soon, and as soon as I do I'll send it to you. My defense team did get a copy of the covering letter, and I should be able to get that for you too.

You wrote, "I would like someone to write an essay that addresses the mistaken public understanding of the Unabomber." It's not clear to me just what you have in mind. In any case, I've corresponded a little with William Finnegan, and, though I had a favorable impression of him at first, I've lost much of my respect for him.

There's no need for you to send me envelopes. The prison gives inmates ordinary letter-size envelopes free of charge. I have to pay for the 9" x 12" manila envelopes, but I have enough money on my account for that. Thanks for offering, though.

As for the copyright issue (which I see as our biggest problem), Mello gave me the name of an expert copyright lawyer at Vermont Law School. I wrote to him about our problem, and Mello says in his latest letter,

"... [H]e mentioned that you'd written to him. He told me he's happy to give you some pro bono general 'academic guidance' on the copyright issues you raised with him; for anything more precise, he said he'd need to get

his law firm on board to establish an attorney/client relationship. He plans to get a letter off to you by the end of this week."

As I mentioned to you in an earlier letter, we do need the "more precise" guidance, because we need someone who can tell us just what parts of my brother's ~~permission~~ letters we can include without his permission — since we're not likely to get his permission.

*

Now the hard part of this letter. I have reason to be very grateful to Michael Mello. He has been very ~~generous~~ generous in helping me to find a lawyer willing to represent me, and it appears that he now has found me a very good one. Without Mello's help I probably would not have been able to find any lawyer at all. Consequently, I do not feel comfortable saying anything negative about Mello. But I think that there is a potential problem with him and his book, and it needs to be discussed. To avoid the risk of putting into circulation any negative rumors about him, I ask that you keep strictly confidential everything that I say ~~about~~ ~~about~~ Mello in this letter. That means that you don't pass it on to anybody — not even your wife or your lawyer or your private secretary.

I gather that you're familiar by now with Mello's virtues, such as honesty, generosity, and an engaging personality. Unfortunately, he also has a fault, namely, an inattention to detail and

an incapacity for handling facts accurately that seem astonishing in a lawyer. His inattention to detail I think accounts for some of the flaws that you pointed out in the § 2255 motion. But, to give you an idea of how bad he is in this respect, early in my correspondence with him I sent him some documents with a covering letter asking him to return two of them to me when he had copied them. Since he failed to return them, I included a reminder in one of my later letters to him. He apparently missed that, too, since he still failed to return the documents. I reminded him yet again, and this time he did return the documents, with an apology in which he said that my instructions were clear and attributed his earlier failure to return the documents to "sloppiness" on his part. But a little later he again failed to notice my request for a copy of certain documents that I sent ~~him~~ him, he again failed to notice my first reminder, and he ~~returned the documents~~ sent me a copy of the documents only after a second reminder. This time he did not bother to apologize.

In an article of his that he sent me early in our correspondence and in his drafts of the § 2255 motion, Mello relied heavily on media reports for personal information about me. I repeatedly pointed out to him that media reports were riddled with errors, and I cited specific examples. I advised him to avoid referring to the media for information about me.

Yet Mello's addiction to media sources seems to be incurable. In the draft of his book that he sent me recently, which I've begun to review only in the last few days, I find that he relies on such sources without apparently exercising any caution whatever. On pp. 29-30 he writes:

"[Kaczynski] tended to gravitate to intellectual boys who shared his developing passion for mathematics and science. This Harvard crowd tolerated Kaczynski because of his intellect and his eccentricities. Kaczynski's classmates 'were chess-players with Elvis pompadours, teenage pipe smokers marveling at Isaac Asimov~~ski~~ and Ray Bradbury, and fantasizing about landing on the moon.' His dorm room was a mess and he played ~~trumpet~~ his trombone loud at night."

For this information he cites Robert McFadden's article in the New York Times, May 26, 1996. In the first place, Mello has not even cited the article correctly. If you'll look up the article yourself, you'll find that the classmates McFadden was referring to were my high-school classmates, not my Harvard ones. In the second place, almost all of the information in the paragraph I've just quoted is wrong. In the third place, I made it quite clear in Chapter XVI of Truth versus Lies that McFadden's article was riddled with errors, and I cited various examples. Mello claims to have read

11
Truth versus Lies at least twice, yet it does not seem to have occurred to him that he should, at the least, exercise great caution in using the Mc Fadden article as a source of information. In the fourth place, ~~in Truth Vs~~ in Truth versus Lies I denied the claim that I played my trombone loud at night, and I gave good reasons for doubting the credibility of Pat McIntosh, who was the one who had asserted I had played loud at night, yet Mello seems to have missed this, too, since he repeats the error about the trombone in his book.

But that isn't the worst of it. I gave Mello permission to quote from my letters to him in his book — except for certain information that I would ask him to keep confidential. Mello did agree to keep confidential what I asked him to keep confidential.

Yet on the lower half of page 30 of his book, Mello quotes information that I had asked him to keep confidential. In the letter in which I gave him the information, I ~~asked him~~ ~~to keep~~ indicated that it was to be kept confidential ~~thus~~ by marking it in the left-hand margin thusly:

CONFIDENTIAL — SHARE
ONLY WITH ALSTON
CHASE

The marking was quite clear, yet Mello evidently copied all of the information from the long paragraph in question without ever noticing the prominent "confidential" marking.

To boot, he must have failed to notice ~~the~~ this sentence, which immediately followed the paragraph: "I emphasize that most of the info in the preceding ~~three~~ 3 paragraphs was given to me orally by Scharlette, and oral information from Scharlette has not proved reliable." Mello put the information in his book without including any caveat about its doubtful reliability.

I suspect that Mello's almost incredible inattention to detail and to factual reliability is going to cost us a great deal of trouble. I haven't yet read beyond page 31 of his book, but if the rest is as bad as what I've seen, it's going to cost you and me a great deal of work correcting and correcting and re-correcting before we can get all the errors worked out of it.

Mello will probably be cooperative, at least at first, since, early in our correspondence, he and I arrived at an agreement concerning factual accuracy. But my experience seems to indicate that people who are impatient of detail and of concern for factual accuracy may be cooperative at first, but when you correct them over and over again they get irritable and start resisting you. I hope that won't happen with Mello, but it may happen, and we'll have to deal with it.

I don't want to discourage you from publishing

Mello's book, however. He'll probably get it published somewhere else if you don't publish it. In a letter of November 6, he wrote me that a certain publisher "gave their director a green light on the project last week and, if things stay on track, the contract should be signed and the manuscript should go into production in a couple of weeks." (But in a letter of November 16 he wrote, "if [Friedlander] offers to publish the thing, I'll accept." He did not explain why he had apparently changed his mind about the other publisher.)

If Mello's book is to be published, as it probably will be, I'd rather have it published by you than by anyone else, because you seem to be prepared to work with me closely on this matter, hence I will be in a much better position to exercise control over Mello's tendency to ignore problems of factual accuracy.

I'm not going to try to dispute Mello's opinions or conclusions, even when I know them to be wrong, but I do at least want to make sure that he gets his raw data right. And of course I don't want him to put into print any of the information that I gave him in confidence.

I'll undertake to assure factual accuracy of everything that relates to me personally, and the accuracy of citations from documents of which I have copies. But it will be up to you to check the accuracy of citations from sources that are not readily accessible to me. (I've already found several errors in Mello's citations.) Moreover, given Mello's

carelessness about facts, his research on John Brown probably should be checked. Perhaps you'll want to have the manuscript reviewed by some expert on John Brown.

*

Have you seen the Foreword that Gary Greenberg has written for Mello's book? I think it's excellent. I have some quarrel with Greenberg on points of detail — his Foreword isn't entirely free of factual error either — but I don't think I'll have any difficulty working this out with him, and on the whole I think he does a superb job of showing the ideological basis of the shrinks' diagnoses of me. Even if it were only for that Foreword I would want Mello's book to be published.

*

One more point about Mello. In your letter of November 13 you wrote, "I now believe that [Mello] is genuinely aligned with you and your needs" My own opinion is that that is true to a great extent; but it may not be entirely true. It's clear that he shares the generally accepted assumption that I am in truth the Unabomber, and, given his strong feelings about the assassination by bomb of his beloved mentor, I think he has conflicting feelings toward me. At least, that's my impression. Nevertheless, I have no hesitation about trusting him. I mean about trusting his honesty. His judgment and his capacity for factual accuracy are another matter.

11.

For obvious reasons, I wouldn't want you to give Mello any hint of what I've told you about him in this letter. And I'd like to remind you that what I've said is strictly between you and me — it's not to be passed on to any third person under any circumstances. It would be a poor way to repay Mello's kindness to me if I were to spread negative information about him.

Best regards,

Ted Kaczynski

P.S. I apologize for the messiness of this letter. It's a first draft, and I haven't got time to rewrite it.

—TK